

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandran, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,309	04/13/2006	Kazuhiro Kubo	P28055	8139
7055 7590 67/10/2008 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE			EXAMINER	
			CARR, DEBORAH D	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/541,309 KUBO ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit DEBORAH D. CARR 1621 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 15-16 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/G5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Attachment(s)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments, see pages 7–8, filed 9 March 2007, with respect to claims 1-19 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under 35USC§112 of claims 1-19 has been withdrawn.
- The following rejections are deemed proper.

Claim Rejections ~ 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " $0 \le k_2 \le 1$ " in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 from which claim 3 depends from clearly states " $0 \le k_2$ ", therefore " k_2 " cannot be " $k_2 \le 1$."

- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- Claim 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds wherein k2 is no "0", does not reasonably provide

enablement for compounds of claim 1 wherein ke is 0. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected. to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicant clearly states the instant compounds of claim 1 can be made by the process of claim 17 except when ke 0. As presently written, compounds wherein k2 = 0 is encompassed in the process of claim 17 thereby not being enabled by the specification.

Double Patentina

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousnesstupe double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated bu, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993): In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985): In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting around provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1,1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13, 18-19 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-13 of

8.

copending Application No. 10/508,704. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both read on phospholipid compounds.

In 10/508,704, there is no integer or range for "m" and it is defined to depend upon how much of the oxyalkylene group was added. Therefore "m" can read on "0" and the ratio given for "m" states it can read on "0" $(5 \le m \le 200)$, based on these facts, the instant invention reads on the instant compounds.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claims 15-16 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would
 be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base
 claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBORAH D. CARR whose telephone number is (571)272-0637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571–272–0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571–273–8500.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Deborah D Carr/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1621

Ddc